REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Abstract

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the present patent application and required the applicant to provide a proper abstract. The applicants have amended the Abstract herein, thereby obviating the Examiner's objection. Specifically, the applicants have amended the Abstract to replace the term "comprising" with "having" and deleted its last three sentences.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claim 7 of the present application under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The applicants have amended Claim 7 to specify that the inner jacketing or sheathing layer is defined according to Claims 1 through 6, by removing any inconsistency between the preamble of the claim and its body. The applicants believe that the amendment clearly indicates that Claim 7 is multiply dependent from Claims 1 to 6 and as such, further defines an invention within the scope of any one of Claims 1 through 6.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 – 3, 7, and 9 of the present application under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,798,427 ("Foster"). The applicants respectfully traverse.

The cited reference is directed to ethylene polymers having enhanced processability. The ethylene polymers of the cited references include ethylene homopolymers and interpolymers of ethylene and linear or branched higher alpha-olefins. The ethylene polymers have a polydispersity index of at least about 3.0; a melt index and relaxation spectrum index such that $(RSI)*(MI)^{\alpha}$ is greater than about 26, when α is about 0.7; and a crystallizable chain length distribution index less than about 3. The ethylene polymers are useful for fabrication into a variety of finished articles such as films including clarity films and shrink films, extrusion coatings, wire and cable insulation and jacketing, crosslinked power cable insulation, molded

articles made by injection molding, blow molding, or rotational molding, extrusions of pipe, tubing, profiles and sheeting, and insulating and semiconductive jacketing and/or shields.

The present invention, however, is directed to telecommunication or power cables wherein the polymer is a polypropylene rather than a polyethylene. The polypropylene has a relaxation spectrum index and a melt flow rate such that RSI * MF^a is greater than about 12 when a is about 0.5.

The applicants believe that the Examiner's rejection is based upon the applicants' misplacement of the word "and." It is believed that the word "and" caused the Examiner to believe that the applicants were focused on the entire composition as providing the desired relaxation spectrum index and melt flow rate.

To avoid further confusion and obviate the Examiner's rejection, the applicants have amended Claims 1, 8, and 9. The applicants amended Claims 1 and 9 to delete the word "and" between "polypropylene" and "having" to indicate more clearly that the polypropylene has the desired physical attributes. The applicants amended Claim 8 to insert the term "the propylene copolymer" to make the same indication.

In view of the presented amendments, the applicants believe that the cited reference does not anticipate the present invention as claimed in Claims 1, 8, and 9 and that the amendments more clearly set forth the present invention. The applicants believe that Claims 2, 3, and 7, which depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, are now also presented such that they are patentable over the cited reference.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-6 and 8 of the present application under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,798,427 ("Foster") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,427 ("Dixon"). The applicants respectfully traverse.

The applicants incorporate their arguments presented in regard to the rejections under 35 USC 102(b). The applicants believe that the Examiner's rejection is based upon the applicants' misplacement of the word "and" in Claims 1 and 8. It is believed that the word "and" caused the Examiner to believe that the applicants were focused on the entire composition as providing the desired relaxation spectrum index and melt flow rate.

To avoid further confusion and obviate the Examiner's rejection, the applicants have amended Claims 1 and 8. The applicants amended Claim 1 to delete the word "and" between "polypropylene" and "having" to indicate more clearly that the polypropylene has the desired physical attributes. The applicants amended Claim 8 to insert the term "the propylene copolymer" to make the same indication.

The applicants believe that in view of the currently presented amendments, the claims which depend from Claim 1 overcome any rejection based on Foster alone or in combination with other references. As previously noted, Foster is directed to ethylene polymers having enhanced processability. It is not directed to cables prepared from propylene polymers having (1) a relaxation spectrum (RSI) and melt flow (MF) such that RSI*MF^a is greater than about 12 when a is about 0.5 or (2) a melt strength greater then about 8 centiNewtons.

In view of the above-described Amendments and Remarks, the applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Kevin R. Hansbro/
Kevin R. Hansbro
Registration No.: 38,485
THE DOW CHEMICAL CO.
2030 Dow Center
Midland, Michigan 48674
(979) 238-9041